



**MINUTES  
FREMONT PLANNING COMMISSION  
REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 9, 2006**

CALL TO ORDER: Vice Chairperson Chan called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT: Commissioners Chan, Chugh, Harrison, King, Lorenz, and Sharma

ABSENT: Chairperson Lydon

STAFF PRESENT: Jeff Schwob, Planning Director  
Joan Borger, Assistant City Attorney  
Terry Wong, Planner II  
Alice Malotte, Recording Clerk  
Chavez Company, Remote Stenocaptioning  
Walter Garcia, Video Technician

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: None

**CONSENT CALENDAR**

**Commissioner Lorenz** suggested that Item Number 6 be added to the Consent Calendar.

A member of the public indicated that he wished to speak on Item 6, so it was heard in its normal order.

THE CONSENT LIST CONSISTED OF ITEM NUMBERS 1 AND 5.

IT WAS MOVED (KING/SHARMA) AND UNANIMOUSLY CARRIED BY ALL PRESENT THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION TAKE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS ON ITEM NUMBERS 1 AND 5.

**Item 1. BAYSIDE BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT EXT. – South of Fremont Boulevard Terminus – (PLN2006-00058)** - to consider a time extension of Development Agreement DA-92-1 for the Bayside Business Park, a 159-acre project site generally located on the west side of Interstate 880, north of Dixon Landing Road, south of the current Fremont Boulevard terminus in the Industrial Planning Area. An Addendum to the approved EIR has been prepared.

**MODIFICATION TO STAFF REPORT:**

*Project Analysis, Development Agreement/City Interests (pg. 6, para. 2):*

*Staff is supportive of the proposed 4-year extension, amending DA-92-1 ~~as shown on Exhibit "A"~~.*

*Project Analysis, Environmental Review (pg. 7, para. 2):*

*An addendum (Exhibit **"2" "A"**) to Final Impact Report EIA-89-56 (SCH#89030071-Informational 2) has been prepared and is recommended for the proposed project (PLN2006-00058).*

**HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;**

**AND**

**FIND THE PROPOSED PROJECT (PLN2006-00058) IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S EXISTING GENERAL PLAN. THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE THE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS AND POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE GENERAL PLAN'S LAND USE, OPEN SPACE, AND NATURAL RESOURCE CHAPTERS;**

**AND**

**FIND THE PROPOSED PROJECT (PLN2006-00058) IS IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS AS SET FORTH IN THE FREMONT MUNICIPAL CODE;**

**AND**

**FIND THAT AN ADDENDUM TO FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 89-56 (SCH#89030071) IS APPROPRIATE FOR THE PROPOSED PROJECT PLN2006-00058 IN THAT THE PROPOSED TIME EXTENSION AND AMENDMENTS TO DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT DA-92-1 RESULTS IN NONE OF THE CONDITIONS CONTAINED IN CEQA SECTION 15162 (I.E. SUBSTANTIAL PROJECT CHANGES OR NEW INFORMATION OR NEW SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS) CALLING FOR PREPARATION OF A SUBSEQUENT EIR;**

**AND**

**FIND FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT 89-56 (SCH#89030071) AND ITS ADDENDUM HAVE BEEN COMPLETED IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS SET FORTH IN THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT, AND ARE ADEQUATE FOR PLN2006-00058, AS PROPOSED, HAVING BEEN REVIEWED AND CONSIDERED FOR RECOMMENDATION BY THE CITY OF FREMONT PLANNING COMMISSION;**

**AND**

**RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL ADOPT THE 2006 ADDENDUM TO EIR-89-56 (EXHIBIT "A") AND FIND THESE ACTIONS REFLECT THE INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT OF THE CITY OF FREMONT;**

**AND**

**RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL WAIVE FULL READING AND INTRODUCE AN ORDINANCE FOR AN AMENDMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT DA-92-1 ALLOWING FOR A 4-YEAR EXTENSION.**

- Item 5. VISTA GRANDE – Mission Boulevard – (PLN2006-00150) - to consider a request to extend, for one additional year, the right to develop based on the regulations in place in 1992, per Vesting Tentative Map 6546, for 17 lots on 12.62 acres located in the Mission San Jose Planning Area. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been previously adopted for this project.**

**HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;**

**AND**

**FIND THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATIONS ADDRESS THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND NO FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW IS REQUIRED;**

**AND**

**FIND THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF VESTING RIGHTS FOR VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 6456 - PLN2006-00150 FOR ONE YEAR IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S EXISTING GENERAL PLAN. THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE THE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS AND POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE GENERAL PLAN'S HOUSING, AND HEALTH & SAFETY CHAPTERS AS ENUMERATED WITHIN THE STAFF REPORT;**

**AND**  
**APPROVE PLN2006-00150, GRANTING A ONE YEAR EXTENSION OF VESTING RIGHTS  
FOR VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 6456 TO JULY 10, 2007.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	6 – Chan, Chugh, Harrison, King, Lorenz and Sharma
NOES:	0
ABSTAIN:	0
ABSENT:	1 - Lydon
RECUSE:	0

## **PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

### **ORAL COMMUNICATIONS**

**Ketan Shah**, Ardenwood resident, presented a petition in opposition of two of the proposals in a proposed land use amendment of the Ardenwood Historical Regional Preserve that contained the signatures of approximately 340 homeowners. The proposed gate on the north side of the park was his main concern, along with the proposed construction of a pavilion. He asked, for the record, that all notification of changes in the Ardenwood area should be sent to him and another signer of the accompanying letter.

**Commissioner Sharma** disclosed that he knew the speaker. He asked if the speaker was requesting updates of future changes or did he want all 340 homeowners to be notified? Had he been a participant in the public meetings held in the past?

**Mr. Shah** replied that he lived beyond the 300-foot notification radius, so had been unaware of a January 25<sup>th</sup> meeting before it was held. He was asking that just the two people be notified.

**Planning Director Schwob** clarified that this was a project by a separate governmental entity, the East Bay Regional Park District, and the city was not the lead agency. However, the city would also make comments on the land use plan. He suggested that the petition be forwarded to the East Bay Regional Park District and the speaker's request for notification should also be made to the District. He agreed to add the speaker's name to the city's list for city-related items having to do with Ardenwood.

**Mr. Shah** replied that he had sent the petition to the East Bay Regional Park District Oakland office and he understood a hearing would be conducted sometime in March or April. He felt it was appropriate to apprise the city of their objections, since the Preserve was a part of the City of Fremont.

## **PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS**

**Item 2.**     **ALSION II – 750 Witherly Lane – (PLN2005-00184)** – to consider a Conditional Use Permit for the conversion of a 3,810 square foot single-family residence into a Montessori secondary school for 40 students in the Mission San Jose Planning Area. This project is exempt from CEQA, per Section 15332, In-Fill Development Projects.

**Planning Director Schwob** noted that emails and letters of opposition had been received from Karen and Brent Wahl, Mark and Valerie Allen, Monvein Kalyampur, Eugene Wang, and a general letter of support from a student's parent.

**Tim Reilly**, co-founding board member and Chief Financial Officer, stated that this school was the only private, non-secular high school program in the city. He introduced Mike Leahy, founding board member and current President of the board.

**Michael Leahy** stated that his residence was the project site for the additional campus. The school was a California, nonprofit, charter school. The current location of the school was at 155 Washington Boulevard with 36 students enrolled in seventh, eighth and ninth grades with three full-time instructors and occasional visiting Ohlone College instructors. They wished to relocate those students to the proposed site in order to facilitate an Early College High School program, which allowed students to attend both high school and college at the same time. At the end of three years, the attending students would earn a high school diploma and an Associates Arts degree as co-enrollees in the high school and in Ohlone College. The proposed new site was located directly across Anza Street/Witherly Lane from Ohlone College and the hours of operation would be from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. Two impacts could be increased traffic and noise. To mitigate traffic, the school would bus the students from the Washington Boulevard location to the new location on Witherly Lane and back. Outdoor physical education (the main source of additional noise) would be held in the early afternoon after lunch for one hour. Maximum daily trips by students, if the bus was not available, would increase traffic by 1.5 percent.

**Chairperson Harrison** asked and **Mr. Leahy** answered the following questions:

- *What was the plan for the “old campus” on Washington Boulevard. Would it be available for the students to meet there and transfer by bus up to the new site?*  
The old campus would remain a school for the lower grades. The elementary program would occupy the vacated building used now by the seventh, eighth and ninth grades.
- *Why did the school open at 7:30 a.m. but classes did not start until 9:00 a.m.?*  
Recent studies had showed that adolescents learned better if allowed to sleep a little later in the morning, so classes started at 9:00 a.m., but the school was open at 7:30 a.m. to accommodate working parents. Informal math study was available at 8:00 a.m. for any early arrivals.
- *What would be the student flow from the proposed site to Ohlone College?*  
The proposed site would provide for teaching seventh graders, eighth graders who would take enrichment courses at Ohlone College and be a place where the ninth grade and up students could come between courses at Ohlone College. Students would cross the street to and from Ohlone College and would not go back to the old campus on Washington Boulevard during the day. The seven full-time Early College students who were attending Ohlone College had to be picked up by parents after a class and brought back later for another class or they had to walk down the hill to the Washington Boulevard school site between classes, which was inconvenient and not a good use of their time between classes. A much better option would be to provide those students their own “home base” across the street between classes.
- *Was the speaker aware of any complaints?*  
He had heard no complaints.
- *Was it possible to use Ohlone College facilities for the physical education class?*  
The education code specifically prohibited high school students from using physical education facilities at community colleges.

Vehicle trips up and down Anza Street/Witherly Lane to the new site and to Ohlone College were discussed further.

**Commissioner Sharma** disclosed that he had met with Mr. Leahy while visiting the site during an outdoor physical education class.

**Commissioner King** asked if the applicant was requesting the CUP because of the site's close proximity to Ohlone College and if this site was the speaker's primary residence. Did his property have residents around his property and across the street? Would the "old campus" still accommodate students younger than the students who would use the speaker's residence as a school? How many students made up the population of the school?

**Mr. Leahy** replied the answers to the first two questions were, "Yes." Across the street was Ohlone College and a horse pasture surrounded his property on three sides, which buffered his property from the neighbors. A total of 300 students would attend school at both campuses with the younger students staying on the "old campus" on Washington Boulevard.

**Commissioner Lorenz** asked if the current facility could be expanded to allow the older students to stay at that location while being shuttled up to Ohlone College by bus.

**Mr. Leahy** answered that expansion was not possible due to Ohlone Indian artifacts on the property.

**Commissioner Sharma** asked if the school had a final agreement with Ohlone College for the use of their facilities. Was the speaker aware of the suggestion concerning a fence along the neighbor's property to discourage interaction between the students and the horses owned by the neighbor? Would he agree to work with the neighbor and staff concerning the fence?

**Mr. Leahy** stated that the college had provided many special accommodations for his students' success. He showed a sample of the fencing material that he proposed to add to the current fence. He noted that an electric wire ran along the top of the fence, and students had been told that they would be suspended if they trespassed on the property. He agreed to working with the neighbor and staff to reach a decision about the fence.

**Commissioner Chugh** reminded the public that the Commission's decision would not be based upon the school's merits, but whether this land use was correct for this location. He asked if the applicant had met with any of the neighbors.

**Mr. Leahy** said that he had initially met with the Allens about two years ago and they had indicated they would oppose the plan. Meetings had been held with the Ohlone trustees three times. He was aware of the letters of opposition. The Allens were to the northeast, the Wahls were to the east and the Azevedos were to the west, all of the properties were buffered by horse pasture. The applicant had spoken with the other two neighbors at the Ohlone meetings.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** asked for clarification concerning the bus schedule. She asked that the speaker address the Wahl's belief that local wildlife could pose a safety issue for the children. Would the sports court be kept closed? It could become an attractive nuisance if the gate was not kept locked to the pasture where the horses were kept.

**Mr. Leahy** stated that the bus schedule would be flexible, according to need. The wild boar, cougars and most other wildlife were nocturnal, which would not affect the students during the day. The six-foot gate was padlocked.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** opened the public hearing.

**Neil Hamady**, parent of three children in the school, stated that Montessori students were taught from preschool about responsibility, accountability and respect. The students were generally inside and could not be heard. Currently, he drove two of his children directly to Ohlone College. He felt that it would be good for them to have somewhere to go between classes, which would allow them to interact with students their own age, since they were younger than most of the other Ohlone students.

**Valerie Allen**, neighbor adjacent to the proposed school site, stated that both of her children had attended private schools and she did not disagree with the concept. The traffic and noise issues had been addressed very well. Her concern was the possibility of future liability, because she kept three horses on the property that surrounded the site. She would like to know whom she could contact in the city if a problem came up in the future.

A discussion ensued regarding the possibility of her horses becoming an attractive nuisance to the students at the proposed site and how that could be avoided. The speaker would be given the name of a staff person as a city contact after the meeting.

**Athena Bringham**, Early College student, stated that she was in her second semester at Ohlone College and, because she was much younger than most of the Ohlone students, a different campus would provide a more comfortable environment where she could study with friends her age.

**Steven Wong**, Director of the Ohlone Early College Program, believed that the proximity of the Alston School to Ohlone College was equal to the success of the program. When the students were out of class, they needed a place to go to be with their friends.

**John Weaver**, parent of a seventh grade student, believed that the needs of 40 students should not supercede the needs of the neighborhood. The current location was adequate with noise being no issue with regard to physical education programs, along with a music program that would not be offered at the proposed site.

**Austin Alexander**, Early College student, was in his first full-time semester at Ohlone College and stated that he had one-hour breaks between classes when he would go to the cafeteria or to a small, rented building on the Ohlone campus. The new proposed site would provide an easier learning environment in which to socialize and do homework between classes. Previously, between classes, he had either walked to or from the current campus or sometimes was driven home.

**Chairperson Harrison** asked what his travel time from the middle of the Ohlone quad to the new campus would be.

**Mr. Alexander** guessed that it would be an average two-minute walk.

**Commissioner King** asked how long it took the speaker to walk to the Ohlone campus from the old campus at this time.

**Mr. Alexander** replied that he currently was dropped off at Ohlone in the morning and was picked up after class and driven home. He guessed that it would take approximately 30 minutes to walk the distance.

**Commissioner Lorenz** asked at what age did the speaker begin attending Ohlone College.

**Mr. Alexander** said that he was 12 years old, two years ago, when he was taking one course at Ohlone College.

**Eric Alexander**, the previous speaker's father, clarified that sometimes he drove Austin back and forth twice a day, but that was traffic that was already there and it would not increase with the proposed new site. In fact, his trips would probably be reduced. Multiple residential trips that were made by Mr. Leahy and his family to and from the current campus location would be eliminated by approval of the new campus site. The speaker who spoke for keeping only one campus at the current location did not mention that students were bussed to a location where they could play during physical education. A physical education location

at the proposed campus would be an additional benefit. He suggested that a buffer fence could be constructed four feet from the Allen's fence, which should alleviate any future problems with the horses.

**Commissioner Sharma** agreed that the distance of approximately one mile to the Ohlone College from the current campus on Washington Boulevard was an inconvenient walk for students between classes and having a campus across the street would provide a benefit for them.

**Eron Bringhurst**, Pleasanton resident and student parent, remembered the time it took for him to travel to the private schools that he had attended while growing up, which was very different nowadays. His daughter, Athena, was 15 and an Early College student, along with two other children also attending the school on the Washington Boulevard campus. He did not allow his daughter to walk alone between the two campuses. He dropped his daughter off at Ohlone College directly across the street from the proposed new site for the Alston campus, as did many parents who had under college aged children who attended Ohlone College. None of the college courses were available back-to-back, so there was significant time in between classes. He would like to see a setting where his daughter could be with students her own age and still have access to an education that would allow her to succeed at a rate that she was capable of.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** called for a ten-minute recess at 8:25 p.m.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** brought the meeting back to order at 8:35 p.m.

**Kyle Weaver**, seventh grade student, stated that he would prefer to continue going to the park where the students at the current location were bussed for outdoor activity rather than going to the proposed campus site. He thought that some students might feel discomfort with taking physical education on private property. He also felt that it was better to go to a public place rather than the school's students being isolated at the proposed new site.

**Mr. Leahy** closed by stating that the students currently went to a local park for outdoor physical education and it was not the best situation, as incidents had occurred that would not happen, again, if the proposed site were used. He had investigated adding the Allens to the school's liability insurance policy, but discovered that he was unable to do so, because their property was not a part of the school's program, as Ohlone College was. He stated that an eight-foot chain link fence topped with barbed wire ran along the border of his and the Allen's property and it wrapped around to the front of the house. The rest of the sports court was fenced with a sturdy, "farm" fence with an electric wire on top. He stated that any homeowner's insurance would cover anyone trespassing on property that had animals on it. He suggested that the Allens install a second, parallel fence inside their property, if they were uncomfortable with what was already there.

The Commissioners and the applicant discussed about how to handle Ms. Allen's concern about her horses and the fence that confined her horses to her property. Mr. Leahy agreed to install the hardware mesh along the existing fence and suspend any student who trespassed on the Allen's property.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** asked about the small building on the Ohlone College campus that the Alston students were using. Was there enough room on the proposed new site for vehicles to pull in and pull out? How many parking spaces would be available on the site?

**Mr. Leahy** stated that his school temporarily rented a 12 by 26 foot building from the college for use by his students, which would expire in April. There was enough room for bus parking and a 40-foot turning radius. There would be seven parking spaces, which would include one handicapped space and room for the bus.

**Commissioner Sharma** asked if most of the traffic on Witherly Lane turned into the Ohlone College campus before the proposed new site was reached with little traffic coming down from the uphill residential area.

**Mr. Leahy** agreed.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** closed the public hearing.

**Chairperson Harrison** suggested changing Condition A-2 to reflect the school hours as being from 7:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. He asked how the Ohlones future commercial development along Mission Boulevard would play out. Was staff aware of any complaints since the Early College Student program had begun? He asked what kinds of fire code would this project need to meet?

**Planning Director Schwob** replied that the Ohlone College Board had decided to develop the frontage along Mission Boulevard for commercial and/or residential uses, which would probably increase traffic along Anza/Witherly Lane, but not as far up the road as where this project would be located. He knew of no complaints. Fire code requirements as related to the occupancy type would be required by the Building Division when the applicant obtained the building permit.

**Commissioner King** asked if a traffic signal was located where the students would cross to the new site from the college.

**Planning Director Schwob** stated that there was no traffic light at that location.

**Commissioner King** complemented staff for its wonderful report. This was a wonderful project. He suggested that a condition be added that would require the school to install the hardware mesh, even if it had to be at its own expense with no sharing of the cost by Ms. Allen. Additional traffic would be minimal. He was prepared to support this project.

**Commissioner Lorenz** echoed **Commissioner King's** comments, especially the liability issues. He had some concern about the existing electric fence, although they were generally low voltage. He suggested that the applicant work with the neighbor to decide upon a mutually acceptable fence. He suggested that a crosswalk might be a safety precaution at the location where the students would be crossing Anza Street/Witherly Lane from the college. He asked that staff meet with Ms. Allen to give her the name of a contact within the city.

**Commissioner Sharma** asked staff for suggested wording for a condition that would encourage the applicant and the neighbor to come to a mutual decision concerning the fence. He had visited the site for approximately 40 minutes, and he had observed the outdoor physical education activity and other aspects of the site. The noise generated was not objectionable. Being able to walk to and from Ohlone College from a "home base" would be a benefit for the students. He would support the project.

**Planning Director Schwob** read Condition A-23 relating to fencing and suggested adding, "The applicant shall coordinate a fencing design with their neighbor to present to the city for review and approval that includes enough detail that would show staff it would prevent someone from readily climbing the fence, putting a hand through the fence and accessing the Allen's property and that it be maintained in good condition." A separate condition could state, "The school should include a policy of no trespass to the adjacent properties, which would result in suspension and/or expulsion, if repeated."

**Vice Chairperson Chan** asked if retrofitting regulations would apply to this residence that was to become a public building. She pointed out to the neighbor that Condition A-5 provided recourse for her, if the Conditions of Approval were not fulfilled.

**Planning Director Schwob** expected the building would change to Educational Occupancy, if approved, and the building would have to meet Building and Fire code requirements, which was not difficult with a wood-framed building.

**Commissioner Chugh** advised that future applicants with projects scheduled to be heard by the Commission should make sure that concerns from the neighbors should be resolved before the Commission heard the item. The Commission had just spent more than one and one-half hours listening to issues that should have been resolved beforehand, and he encouraged staff to be proactive with these kinds of matters.

**Planning Director Schwob** replied that his suggestion was generally part of the routine process that staff was involved in. Sometimes the importance that the neighbor felt about his concern was not clearly understood by staff until it was brought out at the hearing.

**Chairperson Harrison** stated that he would support the project, although he felt a little torn, because of the land use request and whether this was the correct use for this particular property. The education that this school provided was well beyond what was "generally out there, and it's admirable." Many of the students spoke better than some of the paid consultants the Commission heard on a regular basis. He suggested that a condition be added that the liability issues be explored jointly by the applicant and the neighbor with the applicant paying the additional cost of the insurance obtained by the neighbor.

**Assistant City Attorney Borger** stated that a condition that the school would pay for insurance that the neighbor would obtain at some unknown cost was not appropriate for this use permit. It would not be possible to craft a condition that would create some kind of legal relationship that apportioned risk between the parties, because it would not be enforceable.

**Chairperson Harrison** encouraged the two parties to consider pursuing some kind of liability insurance, although it could not be conditioned.

IT WAS MOVED (KING/CHUGH) AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE (6-0-0-1-0)  
THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;

**AND**

**FIND CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, PLN2005-00184, IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S EXISTING GENERAL PLAN. THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE THE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS AND POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE GENERAL PLAN'S PUBLIC FACILITIES AND LAND USE CHAPTERS AS ENUMERATED WITHIN THE STAFF REPORT;**

**AND**

**APPROVE CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT, PLN2005-00184, AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "A", SUBJECT TO FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS ON EXHIBIT "B";**

**AND**

**AMEND CONDITION A-23 REGARDING FENCING AND ADD A CONDITION REGARDING TRESSPASS AND MODIFY CONDITION REGARDING HOURS OF OPERATION.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	6 – Chan, Chugh, Harrison, King, Lorenz and Sharma
NOES:	0
ABSTAIN:	0
ABSENT:	1 - Lydon
RECUSE:	0

**Vice Chairperson Chan** called for another 10-minute recess at 9:15 p.m.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** called the meeting back to order at 9:25 p.m.

**Item 3.**     **HUBVIEW HOMES – 3645 Mowry Avenue – (PLN2005-00349)** - to consider a Finding for Site Plan and Architectural Review (SPAA), a Tentative Tract Map, and Preliminary Grading Plan for a 12-unit residential condominium building located on a 0.34 acre parcel in the Central Planning Area. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been circulated and adopted for this project.

**MODIFICATION TO STAFF REPORT CONDITIONS**

A-1     The approval of PLN2005-00349 shall conform to Exhibit “C” (Site Plan, Floor Plans, Elevations and Landscape Plan), Exhibit “E” (material and color board) and all the conditions of approval set forth herein. This Planned District, P-2005-00349, entitles the construction of ~~45 town-house~~ 12 condominium units.

**Jitender Makkar**, applicant, stated that common areas would include an interior lounge with gas fireplace and a gymnasium/play area on the second floor, which would serve as gathering spaces for residents and guests. The building was a unique Spanish style building with units of approximately 1200 square feet to approximately 1600 square feet.

**Chairperson Harrison** was intrigued by the parking facility and he asked for a description. He wondered how the lush, green walls and fence shown in the color rendering fit in with the surrounding buildings.

**Mr. Makkar** stated that this would be the first mechanical parking in the city, since this is to be a high density, high quality, downtown project. This type of parking was currently available in San Francisco, Berkeley and Oakland. Twenty-eight, vertical, stacked parking spaces would be provided and they would operate with hydraulic, mechanical lifts. The Fire Department preferred a redwood fence at the location shown on the site plan to provide adequate access in case of emergency.

**Commissioner Sharma** asked if one vehicle would be above the other in the parking garage. He wondered how long it would take for the mechanism to lift or lower the first car, as even in an auto shop, it seemed to take a long time for the vehicle to be lifted high enough to be worked on. How common were these parking facilities?

**Mr. Makkar** agreed that one vehicle would be above the other. The two vehicles would belong to the same residence. This kind of parking would work the same as common tandem parking, but this parking would be vertical. These lifts were faster and safer than the lifts in repair shops. Besides the cities already mentioned, he understood that this type of parking was very common all over Japan, and he expected it to become the norm in the future with high density development.

**Commissioner Lorenz** asked if the parking structure in this project would differ from what was shown in the photo, as the vehicles looked like they were at an angle. What size vehicles would this parking garage accommodate and would SUVs be accommodated?

**Mr. Makkar** stated that the model accepted by the city was different from the one shown and the vehicles would be completely horizontal. A garage of maximum height had been chosen and it would accommodate one full-sized vehicle in each stacked space.

**Commissioner Chugh** asked if staff had helped the applicant to find this kind of parking.

**Mr. Makkar** replied that he brought the idea to staff, but they had seriously looked at various aspects.

**Chairperson Harrison** asked if the applicant had stated that the height of the garage would be 11 feet when the report stated that the height would be 12 feet. He doubted that two SUVs could be stacked in one space.

**Mr. Makkar** stated that the required height would be 11 feet, 2.5 inches.

**Planner Wong** clarified that the height of the garage would be 12 feet 2 inches and the height of the equipment would be 12 feet 1 inch. He stated that the company's sales associate had stated that one full-sized SUV and one full-sized sedan could be parked in one stacked space.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** asked what additional fees would be charged to the homeowner for maintenance of this parking facility and how would a malfunction be handled. How "luxurious" would the pricing be for these units?

**Mr. Makkar** stated that it was estimated that maintenance costs would be 400 to 500 dollars per month assessed to the whole complex. Maintenance service was available 24 hours a day. He guessed that each unit would sell for approximately 600,000 to 750,000 dollars.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** opened the public hearing.

**Mr. Makkar** closed by stating that this project was more than "just about parking." This project would provide a special environment for the 12 future homeowners. The two common spaces would provide an opportunity for individual homeowners to interact and get to know one another, which was unusual for most condominium developments.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** asked if handicapped access would be available.

**Mr. Makkar** replied that an elevator would provide access from the basement to the roof.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner King** asked if the Commission was ready for a motion.

**Commissioner Lorenz** complimented the applicant on the innovation involved with this project. He felt certain that more projects with this kind of innovation would be seen by the Commission in the future.

**Chairperson Harrison** asked the difference in the definitions of a townhouse and a condominium. He stated, in his opinion, the Commission had liked the architecture and had no comments about it, so they had focused on the parking, which was something new to the area. It was a great project and he would support it.

**Planning Director Schwob** replied that, typically, an owner of a townhouse owned the land under the unit. With condominiums, the owners owned everything together with the right to sell the individual unit.

**Commissioner Chugh** stated that he would support the project, as well. He expected the parking would be a learning experience for all concerned. He wished the applicant good luck with this new tradition in the city, and he hoped the citizens would like and embrace it. Only time would tell.

**Commissioner Lorenz** stated that **Planning Director Schwob** had mentioned that a video was available that showed how the parking worked, and he asked to view the video to gain some additional knowledge about it.

**Planning Director Schwob** replied that the video could be made available to the individual Commissioners. He added that this decision had not been taken lightly by staff. However, of all the locations in the city, this location within the Central Business District seemed to be the place in which to try it.

IT WAS MOVED (LORENZ/KING) AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE (6-0-0-1-0)  
THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;

**AND**

**FIND THE PREVIOUS INITIAL STUDY CONDUCTED FOR THE PROJECT HAS EVALUATED THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS THAT COULD CAUSE AN ADVERSE EFFECT, EITHER INDIVIDUALLY OR CUMULATIVELY, ON WILDLIFE RESOURCES. THEREFORE, FIND THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THE PROJECT WOULD HAVE ANY POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE EFFECT ON WILDLIFE RESOURCES;**

**AND**

**FIND THAT THE PREVIOUSLY ADOPTED MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION AND MITIGATED MONITORING PROGRAM FOR THE PROJECT ARE STILL VALID AND THAT THERE IS NO SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT THE PROJECT, AS MITIGATED, WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND FURTHER FINDING THAT THIS ACTION REFLECTS THE INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT OF THE CITY OF FREMONT;**

**AND**

**FIND THAT THE PROPOSED PROJECT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE THE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS AND POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE GENERAL PLAN AS ENUMERATED WITHIN THE STAFF REPORT AND FINDING EXHIBITS ADOPTED/RECOMMENDED HERewith;**

**AND**

**FIND THAT THE PROPOSED PROJECT AS SHOWN IN EXHIBIT "A" IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE STANDARDS AND POLICES OF THE R-3 ZONING DISTRICT, AND THAT BASED ON THE SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL APPROVAL PROCESS CONDUCTED, THE EXCEPTIONS GRANTED TO THE GENERAL STANDARDS OF THE DISTRICT ARE WARRANTED FOR THE REASONS MENTIONED IN THE STAFF REPORT HEREIN;**

**AND**

**FIND VESTING TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 7704 SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "B", PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN SHOWN AND PRIVATE STREET SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "C" TO BE IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN AND STANDARDS OF THE FREMONT MUNICIPAL CODE THERETO;**

**AND**

**APPROVE EXHIBIT "A" (FINDING, SITE PLAN AND ARCHITECTURAL APPROVAL), BASED ON FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT "1";**

**AND**

**APPROVE EXHIBIT "B" (TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 7704), BASED ON FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT "2";**

**AND**

**APPROVE EXHIBIT "C" (PRELIMINARY GRADING PLAN AND PRIVATE STREET), BASED ON FINDINGS AND CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT "3";**

**AND**

**APPROVE EXHIBIT "D" (COLOR AND MATERIAL SAMPLE BOARD), BASED ON CONDITIONS IN EXHIBIT "1".**

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES: 6 – Chan, Chugh, Harrison, King, Lorenz and Sharma  
NOES: 0  
ABSTAIN: 0  
ABSENT: 1 - Lydon  
RECUSE: 0

**Item 4. CENTERVILLE GROVE TOWNHOMES (FORMERLY “QUILLIS”) – 4141 & 4155 Central Ave – (PLN2006-00067)** - to consider a General Plan Amendment from Low Density Residential 5-7 du/ac to Medium Density Residential 15-18 du/ac and to Rezone the property from Single-Family Residential, R-1-6, to a Preliminary and Precise Planned District, and an amendment to the Centerville Specific Plan for a 15-unit townhouse development on a 0.84 acre site located in the Centerville Planning Area. A Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared and circulated for this project.

**Rich Quattrini**, applicant, stated that they had held three community meetings, as recommended by staff. Plans had been adjusted to accommodate the concerns expressed at the meetings. More than ample parking would be provided. This luxury project would be consistent with the Centerville Specific Plan with public transportation, schools, shopping and dining within walking distance. Two small homes were located on two very long lots that would be joined for this project. The townhomes would range from 1,200 square feet to 2,000 square feet. Single-family homes in the area currently cost approximately one million dollars. High quality, three bedroom homes in the 600,000 to 700,000 dollar range was more appropriate within the center of the city. Two of the units would be sold at below market rate for 316,000 dollars. A higher density would be too crowded for the site and would fit in better with the surrounding single-family homes, as well as the high-density complexes across the street and down the street in the Maple Square area. Each unit would have a private patio, private, attached two-vehicle garage (exceeding the required 23 spaces) and a large common space would be available to all residents. Guest parking would be provided in the center of the complex, which would discourage parking by people from outside the complex. The CC&Rs would prohibit using the garages for storage to the extent that they could not be use for parking two vehicles, thus, eliminating the use of guest parking by the residents.

**Mr. Quattrini** continued that a row of screen trees would be planted along the rear property line to provide privacy for the existing neighbors. Living areas and balconies would be oriented toward the center of the project rather than toward the existing residences. Windows at the rear of the building would be minimized and the third floor would be restricted to 500 square feet and located toward the center of the complex. A decorative masonry fence would surround the entire complex. He displayed renderings that showed how the rear of the complex would look after construction.

**Chairperson Harrison** applauded the applicant for holding the public meetings, as well as including adequate parking for the project. He liked the architecture and the project. Privacy seemed to have been taken into consideration, with the windows high enough to discourage looking into the backyards of the existing residences. He asked the size of the window on the third floor.

**Peter Jacobsohn**, architect, explained that the higher windows would orient toward the fence line. The bottom of one window on the third floor could be no higher than four feet three inches to allow emergency access from the building. However, at the rear of the building the bottom of the window would be at five feet.

**Commissioner Lorenz** did not believe that five-gallon trees would rapidly grow to approximately 40 feet in height and screen the rear of the building from the existing residences.

**Mr. Quattrini** replied that he would agree to planting 15-gallon trees if it were more appropriate.

**Commissioner Sharma** asked if the only green area in the complex would be the common area. He asked if vehicles could turn either way on Central Avenue when exiting from the complex. The area needed some improvement and this was a project that would provide it.

**Mr. Quattrini** stated that each unit would have a private backyard that would range from 385 square feet to 800 square feet. They would all be at least 15 feet deep with widths of 26 feet to 31 feet wide. Generally, he expected vehicles exiting the complex would turn right and drive around the block, although a left turn would not be prohibited.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** opened the public hearing.

**Mr. Quattrini** closed with stating that the density and the project would be good for the downtown area.

**Commissioner Sharma** questioned that this project was in the downtown area.

**Planning Director Schwob** clarified that the project would be in the downtown Centerville area.

**Mr. Quattrini** stated that the Centerville Market Place would be only three blocks away from this project.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** asked how many projects the applicant had constructed in the city. She complimented him on the thoroughness of his proposal. He seemed to have included this Commissions' hopes and wishes of being very thorough, talking to the neighbors and improving the area. It seemed like it was a great project.

**Mr. Quattrini** replied that this would be his first in the city. Staff had worked long and hard to make certain that the details were right.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner Lorenz** asked for a copy of the verbiage for the CC&Rs that addressed storage in the garages. He asked when the Central Avenue widening would occur and the status of the vacant lot across the street across from the Seven/Eleven. Was parking impacted when more than three bedrooms per unit were constructed? He was unsure that the variety of tree was truly appropriate for the expected screening and larger than one gallon should be used.

**Planner Wong** replied that the City had purchased 20 feet of frontage on this and other properties in the general vicinity for the street widening. He assumed that the work would begin later in the year. A project had been approved for 16 units in 2001 for the vacant lot, but it had not moved forward since then. Parking for a four-bedroom unit was the same as a unit with two or more bedrooms.

**Planning Director Schwob** added that in single-family units, an increase in parking to a third covered parking space was triggered by a fifth bedroom.

**Commissioner Sharma** complimented staff for "strongly encouraging" outreach by the applicant, which "made life easier for everybody."

IT WAS MOVED (KING/CHUGH) AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE (6-0-0-1-0)  
THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;

AND

RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL FIND THE INITIAL STUDY CONDUCTED FOR THE PROJECT HAS EVALUATED THE POTENTIAL IMPACTS THAT COULD CAUSE AN ADVERSE EFFECT, EITHER INDIVIDUALLY OR CUMULATIVELY, ON WILDLIFE RESOURCES AND FIND THAT THERE IS NO EVIDENCE THE PROJECT WOULD HAVE ANY POTENTIAL FOR ADVERSE EFFECT ON WILDLIFE RESOURCES. AS A RESULT, RECOMMEND THE FILING OF A CERTIFICATE OF FEE EXEMPTION FOR THE PROJECT;

AND

RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE ADOPTION OF DRAFT MITIGATED DECLARATION FINDING THAT THERE IS NO SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE THAT THE PROJECT, AS MITIGATED WILL HAVE A SIGNIFICANT EFFECT ON THE ENVIRONMENT AND FURTHER FIND THAT THIS ACTION REFLECTS THE INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT OF THE CITY OF FREMONT;

AND

RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL OF THE MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN (EXHIBIT "D") FOR CENTERVILLE GROVE PLANNED DISTRICT (PLN2006-00067);

AND

FIND THAT THE PROJECT IS IN CONFORMANCE WITH THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS CONTAINED IN THE CITY'S GENERAL PLAN. THESE PROVISIONS INCLUDE THE DESIGNATIONS, GOALS AND POLICIES SET FORTH IN THE GENERAL PLAN'S LAND USE AND HOUSING CHAPTERS AS ENUMERATED WITHIN THE STAFF REPORT;

AND

FIND PLN2006-00067, AS PER EXHIBIT "C" (SITE PLAN, FLOOR PLANS, ELEVATIONS) FILLS THE APPLICABLE REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE FREMONT MUNICIPAL CODE; AND FURTHER RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL FIND THAT THE REQUESTED DEVIATIONS FROM THE CITY'S PRIVATE VEHICLE ACCESS WAYS (PVAW'S), AND ZONING STANDARDS, ARE JUSTIFIED FOR THE REASONS SET FORTH IN THE STAFF REPORT AND IN FINDING NO. 4;

AND

RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT TO AMEND THE GENERAL PLAN LAND USE DESIGNATION FOR PLN2006-00067 IN CONFORMANCE WITH EXHIBIT "A" (GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT EXHIBIT);

AND

RECOMMEND THAT THE CITY COUNCIL AMEND THE CENTERVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "B" (CENTERVILLE SPECIFIC PLAN EXHIBIT) FOR PLN2006-00067 IN CONFORMANCE WITH EXHIBIT "A" (GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT EXHIBIT);

AND

RECOMMEND TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE REZONING AS SHOWN ON EXHIBIT "C" (ZONING EXHIBIT) AND EXHIBIT "E" SHEETS 1-7 (PRELIMINARY AND PRECISE SITE PLAN, PRELIMINARY LANDSCAPE PLAN, FLOOR PLANS AND ELEVATIONS) AND EXHIBIT "F" (MATERIAL COLOR AND SAMPLE BOARD) FOR PLN2006-00067 BE APPROVED, BASED UPON THE FINDINGS AND SUBJECT TO THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL SET FORTH IN EXHIBIT "D".

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	6 – Chan, Chugh, Harrison, King, Lorenz and Sharma
NOES:	0
ABSTAIN:	0
ABSENT:	1 - Lydon
RECUSE:	0

**Item 6.** **DUMBARTON QUARRY USE PERMIT REVIEW – 9600 QUARRY ROAD – (PLN2006-00159)** - to consider an annual review for conformance of Use Permit, U-66-53, and an amendment to a previously approved concept plan, to operate a quarry and asphalt production plant in the Northern Plains Planning Area. EIR 76-6B and EIR 81-40 have analyzed the impacts of the Quarry operation and no further environmental review is required for this annual review.

**Planning Director Schwob** noted that the consultant and staff had visited the site to assess compliance with the permit. Quarry operations were coming to an end, and the quarry would be turned over to East Bay Regional Park to be converted to a campground about July 2007. Repairs would be made to one portion of the site where instability had been noticed.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** opened the public hearing.

**Eric Hentschke**, Newark resident, stated that many Newark residents had been “putting up with the quarry for quite a few years.” He asked if noise consideration was a condition of the Use Permit. He described the noise as a steady noise that could be heard until approximately 3:00 a.m., and it sounded like a large, semi-truck idling outside his bedroom window. He knew that the end was in sight, but he asked that the noise be reduced after 10:00 p.m. He had heard it this morning when he awakened at 6:30 a.m. It was worse in the summer when windows were open. He was happy that the odors that he had previously complained about had been taken care of.

**Planning Director Schwob** suggested that the applicant should respond to the speaker’s complaints. He could not see a specific Condition of Approval relating to noise or hours.

**Commissioner Lorenz** asked how far away from the quarry the speaker lived. Was Highway 84 between his home and the quarry?

**Mr. Hentschke** replied that he lived next door the Westin Suites Hotel, probably half a mile from the quarry. Yes, the highway (and little else to buffer the sound) was between his home and the quarry.

**Bob McCarrick**, President of Dumbarton Quarry Associates, stated that normal business hours were 7:00 a.m. to approximately 4:30 p.m. Only if there was a public works project (i.e., night paving) that required nighttime operation did the quarry operate outside of those hours. However, he was not aware of any work performed last night that may have caused the 6:30 a.m. noise heard by Mr. Hentschke this morning. When the extension was approved in 1997, they had agreed to additional conditions, such as removing some conveying belts, painting some equipment and planting some screening along the easterly edge of the quarry and at the Don Edwards Fish and Wildlife Center. The stack at the asphalt plant had been modified to reduce noise and they had decreased the odor that had come from the newer, more exotic, asphalt blends.

**Commissioner Lorenz** asked if other companies transported the asphalt.

**Mr. McCarrick** agreed that others transported the product.

**Commissioner Lorenz** said that it seemed that the applicant had no control over the noise generated by those trucks; the quarry was just the destination for those vehicles.

**Mr. McCarrick** replied that if “jake brakes” were used by truckers, they were refused a load thereafter.

**Commissioner Lorenz** asked if additional conditions or requirements could be placed on the permit.

**Planning Director Schwob** stated that no notice had been made about changing or limiting the operation, so if the Commission planned to consider it, this item should be continued in order to provide time for another notice.

**Chairperson Harrison** summarized that the applicant had stated that the quarry operated at night only during public works jobs. He totally understood the inconvenience to the speaker. However, the necessity of public works jobs, such as, airport expansions, the overlays for the freeways and highways, meant this was a small price to pay to allow those repairs to be performed at night when traffic was lighter. At the end of the operation of the quarry, a great asset through the East Bay Park system would be available to the public. He suggested wording that would restrict the operation of the quarry to only the times when public works jobs were underway.

**Mr. McCarrick** pointed out that public works jobs were required to be performed at night, so his quarry had to operate at those times in order to provide material for the repair.

**Commissioner Lorenz** reminded the speaker had he had the option to contact the city, should a problem exist before the end of the operation of the quarry.

**Mr. Hentschke** clarified that the quarry was not up and running at an unreasonable hour today. He did not mean to imply that the noise had continued until the early morning hours last night. He agreed to live with the noise, if reducing the noise was not possible.

**Chairperson Harrison** thanked the speaker for his diligence, as he recalled that he had appeared before the Commission before concerning the quarry.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** closed the public hearing.

**Commissioner King** asked how long the speaker had been "putting up with this?" Had he bought his house before all of this noise started? He asked when the quarry operation was scheduled to close down.

**Mr. Hentschke** replied he and his neighbors had been living with the noise since approximately 1997 and he had purchased his house in 1982. He understood that the piece of equipment that was so noisy had not been in operation until the last few years.

**Mr. McCarrick** stated that the asphalt part of the quarry had been in operation since about 1989. The end of industrial operations was to occur by the end of July 1, 2007.

**Planning Director Schwob** added that the use permit terminated on July 1, 2007 with another review scheduled for January 2007. The site would also have to be prepared to turn over to East Bay Regional Park District.

**Commissioner King** was troubled that the speaker had had to put up with the noise from the quarry operations for so long. He asked that this item be continued to allow more neighbors to attend the hearing and to allow the Commission to hear more about the noise. It was easy for staff and the Commission to expect the speaker to put up with the noise for another one and one-half years, since none of them lived there.

**Chairperson Harrison** recalled that the applicant had agreed that the noise did go on at night to support public work projects. He wondered if anyone traveling along public roadways during the day would like to have the repairs done during that time, rather than having the work performed at night. The Commission had to look at the greater good the projects provided for the greater Bay Area. However, the speaker's concerns were valid.

**Commissioner Sharma** fully agreed with **Chairperson Harrison** and, for the time being, the noise was the fact of life. He asked if he was correct in understanding that the quarry was never operated to provide material for a private job when it was operating late at night. Was the applicant aware of any way to minimize the particular noise that the speaker was complaining about?

**Mr. McCarrick** stated that he was correct. During the review, a Condition of Approval had required that insulation be added to the stack and to some of the operating components of the asphalt plant. He believed that it had some effect, but knew of no other ways to lessen the noise. He suspected that the flame that dried the rock and the rotating kiln were the reason for the noise that was still being heard. Not turning on the flame was the only mitigation he knew of for the noise the speaker heard.

**Vice Chairperson Chan** closed the public hearing, again.

IT WAS MOVED (LORENZ/HARRISON) AND CARRIED BY THE FOLLOWING VOTE (6-0-0-1-0) THAT THE PLANNING COMMISSION HOLD PUBLIC HEARING;

**AND**

**FIND DUMBARTON QUARRY AND THE ASPHALT CONCRETE PLANT TO BE IN COMPLIANCE WITH CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL.**

The motion carried by the following vote:

AYES:	6 – Chan, Chugh, Harrison, Lorenz and Sharma
NOES:	0
ABSTAIN:	1 - King
ABSENT:	1 - Lydon
RECUSE:	0

## **MISCELLANEOUS ITEMS**

Information from Commission and Staff:

- Information from staff: Staff will report on matters of interest.
- Report on actions of City Council Regular Meeting

**Planning Director Schwob** announced that the City Council had upheld the Planning Commission's denial of the Qureshi Parcel Map.

The City Council had also approved architecture for the Saigon Village portion of the Globe.

- Information from Commission: Commission members may report on matters of interest.

**Commissioner King** asked the status of Dr. Sandhu's home.

**Planning Director Schwob** replied that the City Council had denied the proposal and the applicant had not resubmitted a new proposal.

**Chairperson Harrison** asked about league training for new Planning Commissioners.

**Planning Director Schwob** stated that it was coming up in March, so he would look into it. He noted that Commissioners Chan, King, Lorenz and Chugh were eligible to attend this year. He asked that interested Commissioners contact him for more information.

It was decided that Commissioners should call the telephone number noted on the information to make reservations for the Form 700 disclosure training to be held on March 23<sup>rd</sup>.

It was also agreed that the new format for the staff report was an improvement.

Meeting adjourned at 10:40 p.m.

SUBMITTED BY:

APPROVED BY:

Alice Malotte  
Recording Clerk

Jeff Schwob, Secretary  
Planning Commission